

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

J.W.

*

Plaintiff

*

vs.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. MJG-13-2386

CORPORAL CARRIER, et al.

*

Defendants

*

*

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER RE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The Court has before it Plaintiff's Motion For This Court To Reconsider Its Decision to Grant Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on May 4, 2015 Or Schedule a Hearing In The Alternative [Document 68]. The Court finds that neither a response nor a hearing is necessary.

As stated by Judge Ramsey in Weyerhaeuser Corp. v. Koppers Co., Inc.:

A motion for reconsideration (or, to alter or amend judgment) made pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 59(e) may be made for one of three reasons: (1) an intervening change in the controlling law has occurred, (2) evidence not previously available has become available, or (3) it is necessary to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice.

771 F. Supp. 1406, 1419 (D. Md. 1991); see also Pac. Ins. Co. v. Am. Nat. Fire Ins. Co., 148 F.3d 396, 403 (4th Cir. 1998). Such a motion "cannot be used to raise arguments which could, and

should, have been made before [the determination on which reconsideration is sought was] issued." Fed. Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Meyer, 781 F.2d 1260, 1268 (7th Cir. 1986). Stated differently, "[a] motion to reconsider is not a license to reargue the merits or present new evidence." Gray-Hopkins v. Prince George's Cnty., Md., 201 F. Supp. 2d 523, 524 (D. Md. 2002) (citation omitted).

The instant Motion meets none of the criteria upon which a properly court may reconsider a prior determination. Moreover, to the extent there is anything in the instant Motion beyond a restatement of the basic arguments already presented, it does not add any weight to the arguments rejected in the decision at issue.

SO ORDERED, on Tuesday, June 02, 2015.

/s/
Marvin J. Garbis
United States District Judge